श्री अशोक गहलोत : चैयरमेन सर, जो दो लाख बेल आ रही है काटन की वह सर्फ इस काम के लिए जा रही है। वह इनको सस्ती मिलेगी ।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : सभापति महोदय, मेरा जो क्युश्चन था, आप भी पूछ चुके हैं, अब दोनों मिलकर चुप हो जायें तो यह भी एक रास्ता है, लेकिन जब दोनों ने कहा है तो उन्हें जवाब देना चाहिये ?

श्री अशोक गहलोत : चेयरमैन सर, जो हैंक यार्न बनता है, उस पर एक्ससाइज ड्यूटी लगती ही नहीं हैं । तो आप कौन से टैक्स की बात कर रहे हैं ?

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : चाहे सेल्स टैक्स हो या जो भी हो, अगर वह उनको सब्सिडाइज रेट में दें तो वह अपने आप कंपीट कर लेंगे और आपके सारे कष्ट दूर हो जायेंगे ।

श्री अशोक गहलोत : चैयरमैन सर, मैं यह निवेदन कर रहा हूं कि हम दो लाख बेल काटन की इंपोर्ट कर रहे हैं . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : हम इन टोटल आपसे कह रहे हैं कि अगर उनको वह सब्सिडाइज्ड रेट में दीजिये तो मामला हल हो जाएगा । बाकी आदर्श चीजें आप पीछे कीजिएगा । हम लोगों की जिंदगी में यही कर दीजिये ।

श्री अशोक गहलोत : मैं यही कहने जा रहा हूं कि वह रास्ता अपने आप हो जाएगा जब उनको सब्सिडाइज्ड मिलेगा ।

SHRI S. MADHAVAN: After the liberalised industrial policy and competitive economic development... *(Interruptions)* will the Government continue to give an assurance of supply of yam to the handloom sector under Voluntary Scheme and encouraging cooperative spinning mills, giving preference to them, to supply yam to the handloom sector and implementing the reservation policy? There is a doubt among the handloom sector people, especially in cooperative sector, after the industrial policy has been announced in this House. Will the Minister assure that the policy of the Congress Government followed for the last 40 years to help the handloom sector on these three lines, will continue?

श्री अशोक गहलोत : चेयरमैन सर, हमारी कोशिश है कि जो योजना हमारे सदस्य कह रहे हैं, हम चाहते हैं कि एन.सी.डी.सी. के माध्यम से अधिक-से-अधिक वीवर्स की स्पिनिंग मिल लग सके कोआपरेटिव सेक्टर में । जहां तक यार्न की बात है, हम पहले भी कह चुके हैं कि पूरे देश के वीवर्स को इसकी तकलीफ है और उसे दूर करने के लिए हम एन.एच.डी.सी. के माध्यम से ही सप्लाई कर रहे हैं और दूसरी योजना भी चला रहे हैं । हमारी कोशिश रहेगी कि हम यार्न को सस्ते दाम पर वीवर्स तक पहुंचा सकें ।

Visit made by foreign Secretary to Washington

*322. SHRI KAPIL VERMA†:
SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA;

Will the Minister of EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Indian Foreign Secretary recently visited Washington to have talks with U.S. officials;

(b) if so, what subjects werel discussed and what was the outcome; and

(c) whether the nuclear issue was also discussed; if so, the outcome?

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI MADHAVSINH SOLANKI): (a) Yes, Sir.

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Kapil Verma.

(b) and (c) Government's statement made on 16.3.1992 is placed on the Table of the House. It contains a comprehensive response to points (b) and (c) in the question.

Statement

I rise to make a statement on the recent visit of the Foreign Secretary to the USA and other related issues which have been raised during Zero Hour in the past few days.

Foreign Secratary visited Washington, March 9.11, for talks on "matters of mutual interest. Indo.US consultations at the Foreign Secretary's level are a regular feature in our bilateral relations and generally cover the whole gamut of Indo-US ties.

Honourable Members have in the past few days raised a number of pertinent issues relating to Indo-US relations. I would now like to address some of them specifically.

Pentagon Paper

Honourable Members made reference to the so-called Pentagon Paper, extracts of which appeared in the US press on March 8, 1992. The paper is actually a draft which outlines USA's perceptions and strategies in relation to the entire world. The report is not a specific position. The paper on India or Pakistan. However, the paragraphs of particular concern to India, as they appeared in newspapers in the United States are the following:

"We will seek to prevent the further development of a nuclear arms race on the Indian subcontinent In this reagrd, we should work to have both countries, India and Pakistan, adhere to the Nuclear Non-Froliferation Treaty and to place their nuclear energy facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards. We should discourage Indian hegemonic aspirations over the other states in South Asia and on the Indian Ocean. With regard to Pakistan, a constructive US-Pakistani military relationship will be an important element in our strategy to promote stable security conditions in Southwest Asia and Central Asia. We should therefore endavour to rebuild our military relationship given acceptable resolution of our nuclear concerns."

"The US may be faced with the question of whether to take military steps to prevent the development or use of weapons of mass destruc tion ....."

Foreign Secretary was instructed to immediately take up these negative references to India. In his meetings Foreign Secretary conveyed our serious concerns on the above. He was informed that this document was a draft paper prepared by middle level Pantagon officials and would be subject to review and modification. India's concerns have been noted by the US and modifications would be made to take them into account. Foreign Secretary was categorically told that there was no perception at US policy-making levels which reflected the negative references to India contained in the Pentagon paper. Officials of both the State Department and the National Security Council with whom Foreign Secretary raised India's concerns, informed him that the paper does not reflect the position of the US on various issues dealt with and that it is subject to further review.

On the reported Pentagon advocacy for a continued substantial US military relationship with Pakistan, Foreign Secretary strongly conveyed our views that while! it was a bilateral matter between the United States and Pakistan, this would na- turally have consequences in terms of India on assessment and policy orientation.

India's position on NPT and 5-power *conference.*

I would now like to take up the issue of India's position regarding the Non-Prolfferaton Treaty. There have been some misleading reports that have appeared in the press that India would sign the NPT. Some Honourable Members had raised this specifically in Parliament. I would like to categorically state that there is no change in India's position with regard to the NPT. In Washington, the Foreign Secretary reaffirmed our position that India would not sign the NPT since it considered the treaty to be discriminatory. The Foreign Secretary unambiguously put forward India's views in this regard.

I would like to make a clear dis tinction between India's position on the NPT and her position on nuc lear non-proliferation. India has always been against the proliferation of nuclear weapons and her record in this regard is second to none. Speaking at the Security Council on January 31, 1992, Prime Minister had set out India's views in this re gard. He recalled the Action Plan for Disarmament put forward at the Thiti; Special Session on Disarma ment in 1088 by the late Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi which sought to ehninate all weapons of mass des truction in Stages, eventually lead ing to a nuclear-weapon-free and non-violent world. P.M. said and I quote:

"The Plan contained all the key elements of a new international consensus on nuclear non-proliferation, First, it called for the conclusion of an international convention on the prohibition of the use of threat of use -of nuclear weapos. Second. it advocated a comprehensive test-ban treaty, Third, threshold states would undertake obligations not to cross the threshold, and this would be linked to correspondng obligations by nuclear-weapon states to eliminate their unclear arsenals by the year 2010 at the latest."

Prime Minister in fact advocated advancing this time-frame to the year 2000. The House is aware that on the issue of signing the NPT, India has been under pressure for several years past, including pressure from the erstwhile Soviet Union. We have consistently taken a principled stand to the effect that while the treaty is discriminatory, what is needed is total and complete unclear disarmament, brought about by balanced, simultaneous, comprehensive and time-bound measures on the lines advocated by India's Action Plan presented at the Thjrd Special session of the UN on Disarmament in 1988. The copies of whcih are available in the Parliament Library. The Prime Minister has elaborated India's stand on all occasions when the matter was raised both in multilateral meetings and bilateral talks.

Honourable Members had also referred to the 5-Power Conference proposal put forward by the United States to discuss security issues, including nuclear non-proliferation in South Asia. During his meeting with President Bush in New York on January 31, 1992. Prime Minister detailed Government's position on this. The Prime Minister told; President Bush that India was concerned about uncontrolled proliferation of nuclear weapons and did not see how this new phenomenon could be stopped merely by measures of policing. Proliferation had taken on a global dimension and required a global approach. India was prepared t_0 talk to the US on non-proliferation but given the practical situation and ground realities. India had to consider on how to deal with the problem. This reality could hardly be dealt with in a meeting of 5 states as such a meeting could become only an exercise in acrimony.

In Washington, Foreign Secretary reiterated India's stand on the above lines in regard to talking bilaterally

with the US on the latter's concerns on nuclear non-proliferation.

Indo-US Naval Exercises

Some Honourable Members had referred to the proposal for Indo-US joint naval exercises. India has defence cooperatoin with several friendly countries, including the United States. India-US defence co-operation is focussed on exchange I of professional information, high i level visits and training. In this context, joint training exercises will be undertaken by the Indian and US Navies. It is the Government's view that these training exercises would be professionally useful to our Navy. No -agreement has been signed in this regard, I wish to state that the Indian Navy has recently conducted an exercise with the Australian Navy,

India remains committed to the Indian Ocean being an area without conflict. India would like to see the maintenance of peace and stability m the Indian Ocean region, fee from intimidation or rivalry in pursuance of the objectives outlined in the 1971 Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

India's position *on special* 301.

Honourable Members are aware that the Special 301 investigation against India on the issue of Intellectual Property Rights has been terminated. The United States Trade Represantative had, however, announced on 26 February, 1992 that an Inter-Agency Committee will be mandated to develop options for possible implementation and action if the facts so warrant. Honourable Members know that trade-related IPR issues are being discussed and negotiated in the GATT under the Uruguay Round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations. It is in this context that Foreign Secretary has conveyed that Indo-US consultations could continue at the Uruguay Round to narrow down differences wherever possible.

Conclusion

The talks that Foreign Secretary conducted with US officials were in a spirit of mutual understanding and friendliness. These talks will continue.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: Sir, we are very happy that the Prime Minister has firmly ruled out a Five-Nation Summit and also the signing of the NPT because it is discriminatory. Still, the bilateral talks are going to be held between the Foreign Secre-lary and the State Department or some other officials. I want to know from the Government as to what would be the nature and the scope of the discussions, the subjects to be discussed at the bilateral talks. What are the Government's expectations from this bilateral dialogue? And what are the possible avenues likely to be explored by the two countries for nuclear non-proliferation?

SHRI MADHAVSINH SOLANKI: Sir, what India has agreed to is to discuss bilaterally with the United States' concerns about nuclear non-proliferation. Now, hon. Members are aware about India's position on Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty which remains unchanged. We view that the Treaty, the NPT as a discriminatory Treaty which legitimises the position of nuclear weapons in the hands of a few powers. The ; Treaty also imposes different setg of obligations on the nuclear powers and the non-nuclear weapon States. India is not going to sign the NPT. But India's commitment to nuclear non-proliferation is a different story. India's commitment to nuclear non-proliferation is of long-standing one and is second to none. This issue being a sensitive one, Sir, some Members i raised the question of India's partiei- pation as just now pointed out, m the ! so-called Five-Power Conference pre- posed by the United States. Sir, when

the Prime Minister met President Bush at New York on January 31, he had made it clear that a Five-Power Conference could not take place in a vauum So, the question is that when India has agreed to discuss bilaterally about non-proliferation with the United States, what are the likely points which could be discussed with that country? China, for example, is a nuclear weapon power Pakistan has recently admitted that she has developed nuclear devices. At least, some of the southern States of the C.I.S, are nuclear weapaon States. So is Israel. There are nuclear weapons in the Indian Ocean as well. India cannot be unmindful of the security environment around it which we would like to press with the United States. What will be the role of outside powers in a Five-Power Conference, if at all it should be restricted to only five powers? Will they be only guarantors of any arrangements made or~ will they be full participants in the process of non-proliferation? What will they do with the nuclear weapons? What will be the terms of reference of the Conference? Besides, there are many technical issues involved. How will arrangements agreed to in the Conference be verifiable? These and other questions will have to be answered before we take a view on the Five-Power Conference. The United States has certain concerns on nuclear proliferation. We know it. We are prepared to discuss this with them at the bilateral level. The outcome of these discussions and the progress we make on the questions I have referred to eariler will determine our approach to the Five-Power Conference.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: Sir, I want to know from the Government whether it is correct that the Indian Foreign Secretary has asked the United States at the recent talks in the United States to concretize the obligations the United States was prepared to undertake to enforce non-proliferation in Russia, Pakistan, China, Israel, etc. And I would also like to know that if we made this request and if we insist on it, does he expect an answer at the forthcoming talks? And what was the response when he made this request to the United States? Are they prepared to give a satisfactory reply at the forthcoming talks? What is the position, the up-to-date position about the Pentagon documents which have created so much of furore? The reports in yesterday's newspapers say that it is being revised. But we do not know whether the offensive portions in regard to India have been removed or not. I want to know from the Government whether the Foreign Secretary will raise this issue also at the next round of talks. And whether he will ensure that these will be removed. What is the present authoritative position or the official position of India on the Pentagon documents? There are contradictory signals from various quarters; there is a statement from President Bush; there are other statements. All kinds of statements are there. There is a confusing picture. I would like the Minister to reply to these points.

SHRI MADHAVSINH SOLANKI: Some of the points mentioned by the hon. Member were raised by the Foreign Secretary in his discussions with American officials and the American officials have taken note of it. As regards the question of the hon. Member as to what matters would be actually discussed during the forthcoming bilateral talks with the United States, it is too early to say. It is only when they sit down to discuss that these various points could be raised. And it is possible that some of the points mentioned by the hon. Member would be discussed at about that point of time.

As regards Pentagon reports, the only information we have got is that our Foreign Secretary discussed about the leak-out to the press, and they maintained, as replied in our statement already, that it is not to be taken seriously, that it has not yet been finally approved or become a policy satement and that until it becomes a

policy statement, it is not possible to take a stand on it.

SHRI SURESH KALMADI: It will be too late then.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: Whether the Government is satisfied, I wanted to know.

SHRI MADHAVSINH SOLANKI: We have raised our objections to whatever appeared in the press, and the US authorities told us that this document is prepared by middle level officers and it is on the draft stage, and that we need not take it seriously. Some of the concerns expressed by India have been taken note of, and while finalising the rpeort, they would take it into consideration.

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : सभापति महोदय, मैं सिर्फ दो बिन्दुओं पर स्पष्टीकरण चाहता हूं । मेरे प्रश्न का (क) भाग है, जो स्टेटमेंट में दिया हुआ है, यू.एस.ए. ट्रेड ला 301 के बारे में । उसमें श्रीमती कार्ला हिल्स का जैसा बयान आया है कि हम लोग जैसे यूनाइटेड स्टेट्स के इंडिया एक स्टेट है, वह डेट फिक्स करती है, हियरिंग फिक्स करते है बड़ी ही अपमानजनक बातें सुनते हैं । इसलिए मैं मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहता हूं कि मान लीजिए थोड़ी देर के लिए कि अगर वह हमारी बात . . .

श्री सभापति : हाइपोथेटिकल बात न पूछें तो अच्छा है ।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : हाइपोथेटिकल नहीं। नोटिस सर्व किया जा रहा है । उनको राइट है और . . .

श्री सभापति : आपने कहा कि फर्ज कीजिए तो मैंने कहा कि हाईपोथेटिकल।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : वह हमसे खरीदगी बंद करें । तो अल्टरनेटिव के लिए आप राष्ट्र को तैयार कर रहे है क्या ? क्या आपने कोई ऐसे मैजर्स लिए है जिससे कि हम उसको फेस कर सकें या क्या अल्टरनेटिव के लिए तैयार किया है राष्ट्र को? किया है तो क्या क्या कदम उठाये है?

मेरे प्रश्न का (ख) भाग है कि मैं सरकार की इस राय से सहमत नहीं हूं कि अमेरिका एन.पी.टी. के बारे में बहुत चिंतित है । मैं समझता हूं कि अमेरीका चिंतित है कि वही एक मात्र विश्व में न्यूक्लियर सुपर पावर बना रहे, दूसरा कोई न रहे । यही हमारा आपसे मतभेद है । फिर भी मैं आपसे जानना चाहता हूं कि जिस तरह की स्थिति अमेरिका पैदा कर रहा है और जिस तरह शनैः-शनैः आप उसमें पांव रखते जा रहे हैं, उससे हमको लगता है कि आप विकल्प की तयारी नहीं कर रहे है। विकल्प से हमारा मतलब है कि अगर हम एन.टी.पी. साइन नहीं करेंगे तो वह पाकिस्तान के जरिए हमारे यहां कश्मीर और पंजाब में और भी उत्पात मचा देंगे और आप राष्ट्र संघ में एग्री करके आए हैं कि सिक्यूरिटी काउंसिल को प्रवेन्टिव एक्शन लेने का अधिकार होगा । ऐसी हालत में हमारी क्या स्थिति होगी ? क्योंकि आप जिस तरह से ज्वाइंट नेवल एक्सरसाइज कर रहे है, दूसरी चीजें करते जा रहे हैं, रामचन्द्र जी को, आप तो बड़े विद्वान हैं सभापति महोदय, राम चंद्र जी . .

श्री सभापति : आप कहां त्रेता युग की बात कर रहे है।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : बाल्मीकि रामायण की कथा है . . .

श्री सभापति : एक हजार बरस से ऊपर हो गए है उसको ।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : तालाब के किनारे एक बगुला जा रहा था, धीरे-धीरे पांव रख रहा था । राम चन्द्र जी को भ्रम हुआ कि बगुला इतना अहिंसक है कि कोई जीव-हत्या न हो इसलिए पांव धीरे-धीरे रख रहा है । उन्होंने लक्ष्मण जी से कहा :—

शनैः शनैः पदम धत्वा, बकः परम धार्मिकः

तो आप जो यह अमेरिका को—शनैः-शनैः पद्म धत्वा, अमेरिकम् परम आश्रिकः और अमेरिकम शरणम गच्छामि कर रहे है, इसका क्या विकल्प है, यह हमको बता दीजिए । हम इसीलिए आपसे यह प्रश्न कर रहे है कि हमारा राष्ट्र इसका मुकाबला कर सके । इसलिए आल्टरनेटिव अरेंजमेंट क्या है, इन दोनों बिन्दुओं पर बता दीजिए ।

श्री सभापति : आप बता दीजिए कि क्या भगवान राम को फालो कर रहे है?

श्री माधव सिंह सोलंकी : माननीय सभापति जी, हम शनैः-शनैः पदार्पण नहीं कर रहे है ।

श्री कमल मोरारका : जल्दी-जल्दी कर रहे है ।

श्री माधव सिंह सोलंकी: और भारत की सुरक्षा, भारत की सोवरिनिटी और भारत इंटीगिरिटी के बारे में जो कुछ भी करना पड़ेगा, वह करने के लिए भारत सदा तैयार है । अभी आपने जो चिंता व्यक्त की, वह तो पैंटागन का रिपोर्ट जो पब्लिश हुआ, इसमें जो बातें की गयीं थीं, इसके आधार पर है । मैंने अभी बताया कि . . . (**व्यवधान**)

श्री कपिल वर्मा : पैंटागन से लगता है कि वह हमसे डरते है, हिंदुस्तान से डरते है ।

श्री माधव सिंह सोलंकी : मैंने बताया कि वह रिपोर्ट फाइनल नहीं है और रिपोर्ट में भारत के खिलाफ . . (**व्यवधान**)

श्री सभापति : सुन लीजिए . . . (**व्यवधान**)

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : आपसे हमने रिपोर्ट के बारे में कुछ नहीं पूछा । हमने कहा कि आल्टरनेटिव क्या दोनों मामले में किया जा रहा है । हमने तो यह कहा ।

श्री माधव सिंह सोलंकी : भारत अपनी सार्वभौमिकता को ताजू में रखकर कोई भी कदम नहीं उठाएगा, इतना आश्वासन मैं आपको दे सकता हूं ।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : हम विश्वास ही करते है । संविधान में ही प्रावधान है ।

श्री सभापति : आप आश्वस्त हो जाइए ।

श्री माधव सिंह सोलंकी : दूसरा, यह आपने कालरा हिल्स के बारे में इन्वैस्टिगेशन 301 के नीचे जो चल रहा था, वह तो डाप कर दिया. आप जानते है । It is terminated. But Ms.. Carta Hills had annoaneed on 26th February that an inter-agency committee would be mandated to develop options, for possible implemeftta tion and action,, if the facts so warrant. At the moment, as the hon. Members know, trade-related intelleetaal property rights are being discussed and negotiated in the GATT, and. in the Uruguay round of multilateral trade negotiations. It was in this context that the Foreign Secretary had said that Indo-US consultations could continue at the Uruguay round to narrow down differences, wherever it is possible.. At that time, the question of taking a decision would arise. The negotiations are still going on.

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र: हमारा जवाब नहीं आया, सभापति महोदय । हमने कहा था कि . . . (**व्यवधान**)

श्री सभापति : उन्होंने कहा आप आश्वस्त रहिए ।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : आश्वासन तो संविधान में ही है ।

श्री सभापति : वे आपको आश्वासन दे रहे है, आप फिर भी आश्वस्त नहीं होते । बड़ी मुश्किल है ।

श्री जगेश देसाई: यह सवाल अधूरा है साहब । वे यह कहना चाहता हूं आपसे कि . . . (**व्यवधान**)

MR. CHAIRMAN. Shri Jaipal Reddy.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: We should not have any bilateral discussions with the USA on the question of trade-related intellectual property rights. It should be only at the GATT.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Nothing will go on record. Shri Jaipal Reddy.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Mr Chairman, Sir, I would like to know whether the Government has taken note of a qualitative and fundamental change that has come about in the scenario of nuclear non-proliferation since the disintegration of the Soviet Union. The US and the other major powers are scared stiff about the loose nuclear weapons, loose nuclear fissionable material, loose nuclear scientists, available for sale, up for grabs, in the USSR. In that context, the NPT,— about which the US is talking, or, trying to dictate to us,—has become totally irrelevant. I would like to know whether the Government of India has brought this to the notice of the US and asked them to bring about a change in their attitude to the whole question.

Part (b) of my question is, the hon. Miniser was good enough to tell us as to what the Government of India told the US State Department. But the Minister has not cared—may I say, 'dared'? —to tell us as to what the US told our Government. That part of it is kept in the dark. Will the hon. Minister throw some light on this aspect?

SHRI MADHAVSINH SOLANKI: As regards the first question, the disintegration of the Soviet Union has created concern not only for the US, but for us as well. It is the concern of the whole world. Now, it has become a part of the discussions on non-proliferation. When our Prime Minister met President Bush in New York, he had made this position very clear. He told President Bush that India was concerned about uncontrolled proliferation, as you mentioned, of nuclear weapons, and did not see how this new phenomenon would be stopped by measures of policy. Proliferation had taken a global dimension and required a global approach. India was prepared to talk to the US on non-proliferation but looking to the practical situation, as you described now, ground realities, India had to consider how to deal with these problems and what type of problems are created.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: What did the United States say?

SHRI MADHAVSINH SOLANKI: The United States said that they have taken note of it and when we happen to discuss bilaterally, these issues would come.

SHRI SURESH KALMADI: Sir. my supplementary relates to the lodo-US Defence Cooperation. In your statement you have said that joint training exercises would be undertaken by the Indian Navy along with the United States Navy and that no agreement has been signed so far.

The first part of my supplementary would be. when is this agreement Proposed to be signed?

Secondly, our main defence supply is from the USSR. The USSR having collapsed, this supply is being reduced. \ would like to know whether the Foreign Secretary, in his talks with his counterparts in the United States, referred to this topic of military purchase from the United States or only, as per your statement, there was a discussion regarding international military education and training programmes of the Defence coastal guards.

SHRI MADHAVSINH SOLANKI: Whatever Foreign Secretary had discussed with the United States Officials is given in detail in the statement. Purchase of defence equipment does not form part of it.

As regar As the second question as to when this agreement is going to be signed, I think Ministry of Defence

would be in a better position to give the details.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: Hon. Minister's reply on the quetion of NPT is not clear, rather raises some doubts because in the last few months we have been observing sweeping change in the Government's foreign policy and day by day they are falling prey to the US pressure. He has said that India will not sign NPT. That is the position of the Government that they will not sign, but they have agreed to a bilateral discussion with the United States on nuclear non-proliferation. Nuclear non-proliferation is a big issue and the Security Council is the Attest forum for discusion on disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation. If they have decided that they will not sign NPT, what is the use of entering into a bilateral discussion on nuclear non-proliferation, what will come out of it? Is it under the U. S. Government's pressure that they had agreed to discuss it bilaterally, so that ultimately they will be pursuaded to sign it? Otherwise, what is the purpose of agreeing to a bilateral discussion with the US on this nuclear non-proliferation?

SHRI MADHAVSINH SOLANKI: Sir, there have been lot of changes after the first Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty was initiated. Several States which were non-nuclear weapon States have become nuclear weapon States and, as just now referred to by Shri Reddy, after the disintegration of the Soviet Union, new situation has arisen. So, a number of questions with regard to the implementation of non-proliferation has arisen and that is why in the discussions with the United States bilaterally some of the points of non-proliferation would come up.

SHRI G. G. SWELL: My question is in three parts. I will take only two minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Make it short.

SHRI G. G. SWELL: Part one of my question is, the Minister even now has said that he will discuss this question of NPT bilaterally with the United States. I would like to know whether he can assure this House that he will be able to avoid and resist about of, Presslerisation.

Now, Sir, the NPT expires in 1995. What is your attitude? Are you going to support the renewal of the NPT? Has this formed a part of your discussions with the United States? With regard to the Pentagon papers, Sir, it is very strange that if, as the Americans say, these are the working papers in the Pentagon, that they were leaked to the press. I would like to know from the Minister whether at some point during his election campaign, President Bush has said that the Pentagon papers basically conform to the policy of his Government. I want you to be specific on that. With regard to Dunkel. Sir, he has said that MS Carla Hills has told our Foreign Secretary that this would be tagged to the next round of negotiations pn the Uruguay round. Now, Sir, we know that..

MR. CHAIRMAN: What do you want to know?

SHRI G. G. SWELL: One more sentence, one more sentence, one more sentence, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Forty-six minutes for two questions!

SHRI G. G. SWELL: One more sentence, Sir. Chancellor Kohl is now in the United States, discussing whether the United States should streamline their differences atfer which the Dunkel proposition would be a "take it or leave it" one. Are you expecting about of Dunkelization in this country?

SHRI SURESH KALMADI: Nationalization, Dunkelization!

(Interruptions)

SHRI S, JAIPAL REDDY: Sir, it it all a part of enslavement.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is nothing but crocodilisation!

SHRI MADHAVSINH SOLANKI: Sir, with regard to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, which would be reviewed in 1995, so long as the pro cess of review has not started, India's stand remains unchanged—that the Nuclear Non-Proliferaton Treaty being discriminatory, it discriminates between nuclear power States and non-nuclear power States, it divides the world into nuclear power States— the have's—on the one hand and the have-not's on the other—India would not sign it. That is very clear. As regards what options India would suggest as is mentioned in this statement itself, Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi in 1988, addressing a Special Conference of the United Nations, had put up an Action\ Plan for total elimination of nuclear weapons from the globe of earth, and our Prime Minister, recenty in his talks with President Bush, reiterated the same thing[1] and said that this Action Plan should be put into effect and it could be advanced, and instead of 20 years it could be completed in 10 years. So, that is India's stand, Mr. Chairman, Sir. As regards President Bush having made some statement during his election campaign, I have no information. The third thing is about Ms Carla Hills' statement. As I have just now said, the negotiations under the Uruguary round are going on under GATT and nobody wants to "Dunkelize"—and I do not know what the exact meaning of "Dunkelization" is—but, so far as our interests are there, we are going to take care of them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question No. 323... (Interruptions) . ..Question No 323.

अधिवक्ता अधिनियम में संशोधन

*323. श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय : क्या विधि, न्याय और कंपनी कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या केन्द्रीय सरकार को अधिवक्ता अधिनियम में संशोधन करने के संबंध में उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार से कोई सुझाव प्राप्त हुए हैं ;

(ख) यदि हां, तो उनका ब्यौरा क्या है ; और

(ग) इस मामले में क्या कार्यवाही की जा रही है ?

THE MINISTER OP STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIA-I MENTARY AFFAIRS AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARMANGALAM): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) and (c) The State Government of Uttar Pradesh proposed that the Advocates Act, 1961, be amended to provide that power to punish advocates for misconduct should also be vested in the High Court. However by a letter dated 5-3-1992 the State Government has informed the Central Government, that on reconsideration, it has dropped the proposal.

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA: Sir, the Advocates Act was passed in the year 1961 and, thereafter the Bar Councils at the Union level as well as the State level have been empowered to initiate proceedings against erring advocates. Now, recently, a conference of Chief Justices was held, which sugegsted that this power should be transferred to the High Courts, and it seems that it is influenced by the resolution of the Chief Justices and the U.P. Government has sent this proposal. Is